



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,255	04/08/2004	Jay S. Walker	04-014	9885
22927 7590 11/02/2007 WALKER DIGITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC 2 HIGH RIDGE PARK STAMFORD, CT 06905				
			EXAMINER FADOK, MARK A	
			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821,255

Applicant(s)

WALKER ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Fadok

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30, 46 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Election

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 4/20/2007, which was received 8/17/2007. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment to claims 30,46 and 47. The examiner has carefully considered applicant's remarks and finds them persuasive in regards to the Double Patenting rejection in light of the amendment, therefore the Double Patenting rejection has been obviated also the USC 112 rejection from the previous office action has been overcome but a new USC 112 rejection was introduced due to the amendment. The applicant's remarks in regards to the rejection on the merits was persuasive, but after further consideration and searching a new grounds of rejection necessitated by amendment follows:

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 30,46 and 47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claim84 of U. S. Patent No. 7,0939,603 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: both provide the collecting of a subsidy by a purchasing entity to supplement a payment to the retailer.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Priority

The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed applications provided on applicant's specification pages 1,2 and 3 fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this

application. For examples only application 09/337,906 provides support for a subsidy being collected by a purchasing system and not a subsidy provider payment to a retailer. To clarify the record and support the examiner is providing an accurate examination of the application the applicant is requested to provide the location of support in all the applications cited. If no support is found the examiner will take this to mean that there is not adequate support in the priority documents and that the priority dated is the filing date of the instant application being 4/8/2004.

Examiner's Note

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers or figures in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 30,46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a purchasing system receiving and making payment to a retailer, the instant application does not reasonably provide enablement for a subsidy provider to providing the payment. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. For the purpose of this prosecution the payment to the retailer and the agreement with the retailer will be considered to be through the purchasing system and that the subsidy amount is considered within the context of what a reasonable agreement is based on supplemental payments such as subsidies.

Applicant directs the examiner to para 00525 and 00526 and FIG 57A for support for the amendment. Para 00525 from PG Pub 20040243478 is not applicable, since the content is directed to a commission amount and is a percentage of the first price not the full first price as found in the instant claim elements.

Para 00526 also does not enable the claims as amended in that once again the subsidy is only a percentage and there is no agreement between the retailer and the subsidy provider. (see paragraphs reprinted below)

0525] According to another embodiment of the present invention, the buyer 5720 agrees to purchase the product at a first price and the seller agrees to sell the product at a "seller" price which may be different from the first price. In this case, the purchasing system 5730 may profit from the difference between the seller price and the buyer price,

Art Unit: 3625

if any. As shown in FIG. 57A, the purchasing system may also receive payment of a commission amount from a commission provider 5770. The commission provider 5770 may be, for example, the buyer 5720, the seller 5750, the retailer 5740, a product manufacturer or a combination thereof. The commission amount may be, for example, a percentage of the first price, the seller price or the settlement price, or a predetermined amount.

[0526] According to another embodiment of the present invention, a subsidy provider 5760 provides payment of a subsidy amount to subsidize the purchase of the product by the buyer 5720. The subsidy provider 5760 may be, for example, the seller 5750, the retailer 5740, a product manufacturer, a third party or the purchasing system 5730.

The examiner has founds the following paragraphs of the applicant's PG PUG that include the key terms retailer, subsidy and exchange. All the embodiments have the agreement and payment being made through the purchasing system, therefore the payment based on an agreement between the subsidy provider and the retailer is not enabled in the context of the claims as written (see para 129, 345, 528, 529, and 546 below)

Art Unit: 3625

[0129] To determine whether or not the buyer offer is acceptable and/or how the buyer offer will be accepted (e.g., which product at which retailer), the purchasing system device 310 may compare the offer price with a settlement price associated with a product that successfully meets the buyer's offer information. A settlement price may be, for example, the amount that must be provided to a retailer by the purchasing system in exchange for providing a product to a buyer. A potential seller may also have a minimum acceptable price, which is the lowest price that the seller (as opposed to the retailer) will let the product be sold for (e.g., to prevent brand name dilution). In making this comparison, the purchasing system device 310 may also take into account supplemental price information, such as a manufacturer subsidy amount, a retailer subsidy amount, a purchasing system subsidy amount, and/or a "third-party" subsidy amount associated with the product. As used herein, a third-party subsidy amount may be, for example, an amount that a third-party agrees to provide in exchange for a promise regarding, an action by, or information about the buyer. For example, a credit card company may agree to add \$50 towards the purchase of a home stereo if a buyer submits a credit card application to the company. See, for example, U.S. patent application Ser. No. 08/943,483 filed Oct. 3, 1997 and entitled "System and Method for Facilitating Acceptance of Conditional Purchase Offers" (97-072), the entire contents of which are hereby incorporated by reference.

Detail Description Paragraph:

[0345] To determine whether or not the buyer offer is acceptable and/or how the buyer

Art Unit: 3625

offer will be accepted (e.g., which product at which retailer), the purchasing system device 2900 may compare the offer price with one or more settlement prices associated with a product that successfully meets the buyer's offer information. A settlement price may be, for example, the amount that must be provided to a retailer by the purchasing system in exchange for providing a product to a buyer. A potential seller may also have a minimum acceptable price, which is the lowest price that the seller (as opposed to the retailer) will let the product be sold for (e.g., to prevent brand name dilution). In making this comparison, the purchasing system device 2900 may also take into account supplemental price information, such as a manufacturer subsidy amount, a retailer subsidy amount, a purchasing system subsidy amount, and/or a "third-party" subsidy amount associated with the product. As used herein, a third-party subsidy amount may be, for example, an amount that a third-party agrees to provide in exchange for a promise regarding, an action by, or information about the buyer. For example, a credit card issuing bank may agree to add \$50 towards the purchase of a home stereo if a buyer submits a credit card application. See, for example, U.S. patent application Ser. No. 08/943,483 filed Oct. 3, 1997 and entitled "System and Method for Facilitating Acceptance of Conditional Purchase Offers" (97-072) and U.S. patent application Ser. No. 09/219,267 filed Dec. 23, 1998 and entitled "Method and Apparatus for Facilitating Electronic Commerce Through Providing Cross-Benefits During a Transaction." The entire contents of these applications are hereby incorporated by reference.

Detail Description Paragraph:

[0528] The settlement system 5700B illustrated in FIG. 57B includes a purchasing system 5732 that sells a product to a buyer 5722 at a first price. That is, the purchasing system 5732 is also acting as the seller 5750 shown in FIG. 57A. As before, the retailer 5742 agrees to provide the product to the buyer 5722 in exchange for payment of a settlement price, and the purchasing system may receive additional payments from a subsidy provider 5762 and a commission provider 5772.

Detail Description Paragraph:

[0529] The settlement system 5700C illustrated in FIG. 57C includes a purchasing system 5734 that arranges for a retailer 5744 to sell a product to a buyer 5724 at a first price. That is, the retailer 5744 is also acting as the seller 5750 shown in FIG. 57A. As before, the purchasing system may receive additional payments from a subsidy provider 5764 and a commission provider 5774. In this case, however, the retailer 5744 agrees to provide the product to the buyer 5724 in exchange for payment of a seller price (which may be equal to or based on the first price), not a settlement price.

Detail Description Paragraph:

[0546] In making this comparison, the purchasing system device 5900 may also take into account supplemental price information, such as a manufacturer subsidy amount, a retailer subsidy amount, a purchasing system subsidy amount, and/or a "third-party" subsidy amount associated with the product. As used herein, a third-party subsidy amount may be, for example, an amount that a third-party agrees to provide towards the

Art Unit: 3625

purchase of a product in exchange for a promise regarding, an action by, or information about the buyer. For example, a credit card issuer may agree to add \$50 towards the purchase of a home stereo if a buyer submits a credit card application to the issuer. See, for example, U.S. patent application Ser. No. 08/943,483 filed Oct. 3, 1997 and entitled "System and Method for Facilitating Acceptance of Conditional Purchase Offers" (97-072), the entire contents of which are hereby incorporated by reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30,46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendwine.com, in view of The Record and further in view of Drug rebate (a collection of articles from PTO 892) or Weiffering.

In regards to claims 30,46 and 47, Sendwine.com (an article found in PTO 892), teaches financial agreements being made between a purchasing system and a retailer to deliver a product based on a first price agreed to between the retailer and the purchasing system and not on a price agreed to between the buyer and the purchasing system, but does not specifically mention that the buyer is taking possession of the product. The Record teaches an Internet order for alcoholic beverages being picked up

Art Unit: 3625

at a local retailer. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Sendwine.com, the picking up of the product from a local retailer, because this would assure that identification is checked and a proper legal transaction is consummated. Further, it would have been obvious to make the combination because all the claimed elements were known in the art and one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (KSR International Co. V. Teleflex Inc¹²⁷ S.Ct at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396). One would be prompted to make the combination since a specific list of parts may not be readily available to the user.

The combination of Sendwinw.com and The record teach determining a payment between a retailer and an online seller, but does not specifically mention that the payment is subsidized by a subsidy provider. Drug rebates and Weiffering both teach how entities receive rebates from manufacturers. Drug rebates teaches that the seller agrees to a payment to a pharmacy and then receives payments from the manufacturer through PBM's to subsidize the payment to a Pharmacy. Weiffering teaches how sellers are paid rebates to subsidize the sale of a product. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include receiving rebates that subsidize the sale of a product, because receiving the subsidies from a manufacturer can increase profits by allowing the product to sell at a more competitive

Art Unit: 3625

or discount rate. Further, it would have been obvious to make the combination because all the claimed elements were known in the art and one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (KSR International Co. V. Teleflex Inc. 127 S.Ct at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396). One would be prompted to make the combination since a specific list of parts may not be readily available to the user.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30, 46 and 47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3625

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **571.272.6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Jeffrey A. Smith** can be reached on **571.272.6763**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

571-273-8300

[Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled

"Box AF"]

For general questions the receptionist can be reached at

571.272.3600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 3625

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. .

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Fadok', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Mark Fadok

Primary Examiner